

White Paper

Report ID: 110225

Application Number: HT-50078-13

Project Director: Jennifer E. Guiliano

Institution: Indiana University, Indianapolis

Reporting Period: 10/1/2013-9/30/2016

Report Due: 12/31/2016

Date Submitted: 2/28/2017

White Paper

Grant # HT-50078-13

Building an Accessible Future for the Humanities

Project Director: Jennifer Guiliano
Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis

December 31, 2016

White Paper

Overview

Building an Accessible Future for the Humanities (Accessible Future), five two-day workshops directed by Assistant Professor of History Dr. Jennifer Guiliano and Associate Professor of English (USC Upstate) George Williams, received an Institutes for Advanced Topics in the Digital Humanities Grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities in July of 2013. For the first two workshops (Boston and Austin), the Maryland Institute for Technology in the Humanities (MITH) at the University of Maryland partnered with the BrailleSC.org project, the Northeastern Center for Digital Humanities, the Emory University Libraries Digital Commons (DiSC), the Center for Digital Research in the Humanities (CDRH) at the University of Nebraska, the College of Information at the University of Texas-Austin, and the Center for Digital Humanities at University of California Los Angeles, CA to foster the making digital environments accessible and usable by blind, low-vision, deaf, and hard-of-hearing users by staging these workshops. For its last three workshops, Accessible Future has been lead by Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI).

Accessible Future engaged scholars working in digital humanities, information studies, and librarianship with resources, training, and a community of people that can assist them with accessibility issues in their own research, training, and teaching. AccessibleFuture represented an investment in developing and educating humanities scholars with all levels of expertise—from beginner to the most advanced—about technologies, design standards, and accessibility issues associated with the use of digital technologies. Of particular note in this final report is the completion of work being done by project personnel on the development and publication of workshop curriculum and results. As outlined below as of December 31, 2016, the Accessible Future Institute met all goals within the allotted time and met its final set of obligations. These goals with the outlined accomplishments are listed in Appendix I.

Lessons Learned

The workshop team initiated the Building an Accessible Future for the Humanities project as a follow-on activity to two different accessibility projects: 1) the BrailleSC (www.braillesc.org), an open source educational resource for individuals in South Carolina who are visually impaired as well as for their families, friends, and educators; and 2) Making the Digital Humanities More Open, an NEH-funded level 2 Start-Up grant that project designed, developed, and deployed a WordPress-based accessibility tool to create braille content for end-users who are blind or have low vision. Through those projects, our team identified that the increasing impact of digital technologies on humanities scholarship had primed a conversation about the importance of making digital environments accessible and usable by blind, low-vision, deaf, and hard-of-hearing users.

Scholars who offer courses had been able to turn to their University-level instructional technologies staff, however, those who were designing, building, and implementing outside of the classroom (as most humanities-research projects do) had been unable to get the help or guidance that they need. These types of research and the issues of accessibility that they interact with are not the accessibility issues usually addressed by disability support services offices on campuses. These campus resources generally concentrate on students and their engagement with course materials (exams and textbooks) or the physical environment (assistive devices). As a result, humanists looking for assistance in building, designing, and implementing digital projects for assisted users have been largely ignored. A survey of compliance for notable digital humanities projects prior to the Institutes suggested that not only is accessibility peripheral to design thinking, it is often only addressed once a user lodges an accessibility concern with a project. No major digital humanities center had, at that time, a public statement related to

its accessibility practices and, just as importantly, no major digital humanities project that we were aware of conducted user testing with members of differently-abled communities.

After five workshops training scholars from a cross-section of academic and GLAM institutions, we confidently state that there is a very strong continuing need for training in accessibility across the spectrum from introductory, to intermediate, to advanced. Introductory training would include many of the activities that we offered as part of our series---introductions to the issues of accessibility, overviews of common tools that can be leveraged with popular CMS systems, and development of accessibility plans both at the project and the institutional levels to integrate accessible thinking to digital humanities projects. The Web Accessibility Initiative ([WAI](#)) offers four key guidelines for accessibility for web:

- [Authoring Tool Accessibility Guidelines \(ATAG\)](#) addresses authoring tools
- [Web Content Accessibility Guidelines \(WCAG\)](#) addresses Web content, and is used by developers, authoring tools, and accessibility evaluation tools
- [User Agent Accessibility Guidelines \(UAAG\)](#) addresses Web browsers and media players, including some aspects of assistive technologies
- [W3C technical specifications](#) (HTML, XML, CSS, SVG, SMIL, etc.)

Introductory training provides a brief overview of all four areas, with significant time set aside for participants to ask questions about situations that they encountered either in their workshop preparation or their practice as digital humanists.

Intermediate training would likely comprise concentrated development of digital humanities projects that seek user training, testing, and workflows for compliance with the guidelines above. In this type of training, teams would be brought together to concentrate on project work including augmentation of audio and video files, integration of accessibility plugins, iterative testing, and documentation development. In our series, we conducted a miniature version of this where participants used suites of tools to test both “famous” (e.g. the Shakespeare Quartos Archive, the Blake Archive, the Bracero Project) and lesser-known projects (e.g. Visualizing Emancipation, the Edward Curtis Project, etc.). Participants remarked on the ways in which projects that utilized structured textual data via HTML and CSS held up much better to accessibility testing than those that relied on visual or auditory presentations. In addition, they noted that commonly used content management systems like Wordpress and Omeka are easily manipulated to avoid meeting accessibility standards; they do not require the inclusion of alt-tags, transcriptions, descriptive information, skip-NAV, ARIA, etc. Wordpress has made strides, particularly in the last two years to address this by noting which themes meet W3C standards. Similarly developers have begun releasing plugins that offer add-on accessibility (like text size, font size and spacing, and color) to any site. The Center for History and New Media, which developed and hosts the Omeka platform, authored an accessibility statement in September of 2015 committing that all development from Omeka version 2.3 on would meet section 508 compliance of the Americans with Disabilities Act. Importantly, though, they note that the implementation of accessibility is the responsibility of the user. Participants were surprised at just how many projects were partially, if not fully, inaccessible to blind, low-vision, or hard-of-hearing users. And, many noted that when testing for cognitive challenges, an overwhelming majority of digital projects required high level cognitive skills to navigate and interact with the project. Again and again, it was noted that when participants approach their own digital projects, the questions of alternative user communities and testing happen not at project conception but during the final phases of the project if at all. Repeatedly, participants remarked that the pool of users that they consider are almost always able-bodied individuals who reflect themselves (e.g. faculty to faculty, librarian to librarian, student to student, etc.) Even when participants assembled a cross-section of potential users (most often referred to as “the public”), almost never did that user group include a user who identified as disabled. Three conditions disrupted that trend: 1) the project was initiated from the field of disability studies; 2) a member of the project team identified as a disabled user; or 3) the explicit user community provided a pool of potential testers who were disabled.

For our team, these trends and conditions suggest a number of greater challenges that the digital humanities must address. First, digital humanities projects must be required to meet the minimum 508

standard established by the Americans with Disabilities Act *and* should meet the WIA W3C guidelines for accessibility. We urge all competitive review processes (e.g. grants, published project reviews, awards, etc) to begin including criteria for evaluating a project's accessibility. By raising accessibility to the level of competitive review, it both signals a commitment to the values of accessible and universal design and recognizes the reality that most users will move through states of disability over the course of their lifetimes. A large number of digital humanities projects that receive federal funding or competitive awards do not meet the minimum criteria for accessibility. Just as we now require data management plans, so too should we require accessibility plans. Incorporating a required accessibility statement for all grants, reviews, and awards would provide a way for users to understand the project's values as well as its implementation of technical guidelines. For example, we encountered a number of projects that provided almost no documentation on the project team, its user testing, nor its preferred contact method to provide feedback on issues related to accessibility. This is particularly key as a project ages; having a clear line of responsibility of whom to talk to should the project degrade to the point it is no longer meeting requirements demonstrates ongoing commitment to one's audience. Second, we urge all digital projects regardless of their current state to conduct an accessibility audit. These audits should be conducted not just during project development but at regular moments post-publication of the project. If the project elects to not update or is deemed "finished", we encourage depositing of a final statement on accessibility that addresses any accommodations or deficiencies that the project may have so that those using the project or who might seek to develop it further have a clearly identified pathway forward. Third, our workshop series has clearly demonstrated that there is need for digital humanities training at all levels (undergraduate and graduate formal curriculum, ad hoc workshops, asynchronous lessons, and intensive institutes) to begin assigning accessibility readings as a key component of digital humanities education. In surveying digital humanities curriculum, very few programs explicitly address accessibility as a module within the curriculum; most frequently, it appears as part of user interface and accessibility training for those in library and information science. Rarely does it receive intensive engagement within non-interface contexts.

Importantly, we tapped only a small portion of the potential digital humanities community (those who self-selected) for our series of workshops. However, as we worked with the various participants it was made clear that they often were the "tip of the spear" of potential participants. Many returned to their home institutions and presented on the results of their training with some developing guidelines for use in their own work. This is particularly true for those who are engaged in advanced technological work related to digital humanities development. As part of our series, we engaged with a number of digital humanities developers who sought not just remedial thinking about their existing projects but also a desire to re-design from the ground up their platforms to incorporate universal design and other forms of accessibility into both the front and the back end of their technology. This type of advanced work would require pools of users available for testing as well as iterative opportunities for coding and testing. It would be wise of any institution doing digital humanities development to establish a user group that represents a cross-section of able-bodied and non-able bodied users that can be brought into the development process at different stages. Note that the project team highly recommends that the user group not only receive credit and attribution within the project but also be employed as paid labor within the project structure. This is particularly key as the type of labor associated with accessibility testing can be quite extended due to both its intensity and iterative nature.

Finally, the Accessible Future project team notes that issues of accessibility are the domain of a multitude of academic disciplines, stretch across many types of digital technologies, and cross the public-academic-private divides. Disability studies, the recognized sub-field that is leading the intellectual way, is a constituent community that the digital humanities would be wise to engage with both in terms of frequency and potential partnerships. We encourage scholars to identify their local and institutional resources that are engaged in producing scholarship on disability as well as serving the needs of those with disabilities. These communities offer ready challenges for humanists to learn from and to assist with. Additionally, by listening to non-able bodied individuals regarding their needs and engagements with digital humanities, the larger humanities understanding of the human experience will grow.

Workshop Accomplishments and Audiences

The Building an Accessible Future for the Humanities Workshop served a diverse audience of 132 attendees at five workshops over the course of two and a half years. Cumulatively, we provided workshops to 34 faculty, 28 librarians, 8 members of public organizations or businesses, 37 staff members of academic institutions, and 23 graduate students. This dovetailed with our stated goal of bringing together individuals from across the humanities (faculty, staff, students and members of public humanities organizations).

Our attendees represented 42 US states and 5 countries:

AR (1), CA (21), CO (1), DC (1), GA (14), IA (1), IL (3), IN (2), KY (1), LA (1), MA (15), ME (1), MI (3), MN (1), MO (1), MS (1), NC (3), NE (9), NH (1), NJ (1), NV (1), NY (8), OH (1), OR (2), PA (3), SC (2), TN (2), TX (19), VA (3), WA (1), WI (1), WV (1), Canada (2), Mexico (1), and India (1).

Ninety-two attendees were female; Forty attendees were male. Importantly, each workshop then offered an opportunity for women in the humanities to develop technical skills related to accessibility in a predominately female workshop environment.

Our initial project goals were to provide education on accessible theory, design, and implementation for digital humanities. We are quite confident that all 132 attendees were served by the curriculum provided and that the communal atmosphere of the workshop extended the impact of the events as represented in our workshop products.

Workshop Evaluation and Continuation

Informal qualitative feedback was provided by workshop host institutions, which signaled that their hosting their workshop allowed their own organization the opportunity to access and evaluate their own accessibility training and practice. Workshop participants evaluated each workshop immediately following its conclusion via a Google form. We asked the following core questions in addition to asking participants to rate the effectiveness of each instructor who led a curricular module:

- Rate the overall success of this workshop in educating participants on issues of accessibility, design, and implementation in digital environments.
- Rate the potential impact of this workshop on your current practice as a scholar, teacher, or researcher.
- Which portions of the workshop did you find most interesting and why?
- Which portion of the workshop did you find least interesting and why?
- What might you plan to implement in the near future?
- What might you plan to implement in the long-term?

Overall, the evaluations from the attendees were overwhelmingly positive. Below is very brief selection of anonymous comments from attendees:

- I think the diversity of the group that was brought together was tremendous. Accessibility is not a singular problem -- it has to be addressed on all levels and therefore requires a diverse group of people. Keep the groups diverse in the next workshops! (Workshop Boston)
- The high-level discussions were terrific. It was really helpful for me to think not only about the specific tactics I can use to improve my work, but also to spend time refining what we mean by accessibility, why it matters, and ways to approach the questions that it raises. The tools will all change over time, but those questions won't. (Workshop Boston)

- Best practices for coding and solutions for advocating for accessibility issues were the two most helpful portions as they provided me with tools to use at my institution. I also really appreciated the opportunity to become more familiar with assistive technologies, as well as the low vision simulator, which helped me feel more acclimated to the issues relevant to differently abled users. (Workshop Boston)
- I'm new to disability studies and research, and I'm also someone who is actively involved in writing and archival work online. The workshop was an eye-opening experience, in that it brought home the need to consider accessibility issues in digital humanities project and provided an impressive range of resources to help people like me improves the accessibility of my projects. Specifically, my work with the Omeka and Wordpress platforms has been directly impacted, and I've already (with the people I work with) begun to address accessibility issues. I would not feel so compelled to do so had I not attended this workshop. (Workshop Boston)
- I appreciated having readings to complete before the workshop, since I am new to the field. It was incredibly helpful! I loved the presentations on different topics. (Workshop Austin)
- Everything - I am almost totally new to accessibility, and, as a student, this was really formative and foundational. It will impact all of my future work, even my course of studies. I also found Dan Brown from HumanWare to be a very informative and engaging speaker. I am so glad I was able to attend. Thank you! (Workshop Austin)
- The closing brainstorming on obstacles and potential solutions was particularly valuable. (Workshop Austin)

In part, the positive feedback of these attendees was a result of in-room dynamic created by attendees. Participants were extremely forthcoming at the workshops on what they understood, what they struggled with, and what they wanted to know more about. Importantly, we restructured the workshops as we moved through them to allow for the flex of what the participants themselves wanted to know. Moving towards more small group discussions and hands-on evaluations rather than full room discussions was one such intervention as was minimizing the role of some instructors and expanding the roles of others based on how participants were engaging with the materials.

We learned that a key component of the workshop success was the robust backchannel available to attendees. For each workshop we established a hashtag (#AFBoston, #AFAtlanta, #AFAustin, #AFLincoln, #AFucla) that was monitored as well as a Google document that could be used for live-note taking by participants and instructors. These mechanisms allowed us to respond to participant questions both in-room as well as following the workshop completion.

Importantly, as a leadership team, we were most proud of the workshop evaluations for their signaling that participants envisioned these workshops as having long-term impact on their daily practice as digital humanities: developing instructional materials for their colleagues and faculty using our workshop materials; undertaking specific technical learning to increase their own responsibilities for accessible development; instituting organization and project wide accessibility reviews; holding meetings with colleagues to discuss the philosophical and practical importance of an accessible vision and practice for their institution; and writing accessibility practices into project funding and future grants to ensure compliance with standards.

Accessible Future continues (as of 2017) in the capable hands of George Williams and Erin Templeton. George was one of our core instructors with Erin attending our AFLA workshop. Collaboratively, they've used the Accessible Future curriculum as a base for their ongoing annual workshop at the Digital Humanities Summer Institute (dhsi.org).

The workshop series also continues with a rich social media life where former participants continue to

share resources and remark on the impact of the workshops on their practice (see @AccessibleFU and #accessiblefuture on twitter). Interestingly, the instructors recognized the impact of offering this training for their own digital humanities affiliations. The University of Virginia's Scholars Lab authored its own public accessibility statement following our first workshop at the behest of instructor Jeremy Boggs while the Maryland Institute for Training in the Humanities at the University of Maryland began integrating more accessibility testing via its involvement in this series. Brandon Locke, who runs the LEADR lab at Michigan State University also implemented an accessibility statement as part of his attendance as a participant at our workshop.

Workshop Products and External Impact

Building An Accessible Future for the Humanities website: <http://www.accessiblefuture.org/>

Susan Floyd, "Thinking about accessibility: Accessible Future 2014 at UT-Austin," March 14, 2014. <https://texarchivist.com/2014/03/14/thinking-about-accessibility-accessiblefu-2014-utaustin-2/>

Anne Donlon, Emory University, "Review of the Accessible Future Workshop at Emory University", Journal of Interactive Technology & Pedagogy, June 4, 2015. <https://jitp.commons.gc.cuny.edu/making-accessible-futures/>

Meredith Dabek, Maynooth University (Ireland), "Access & Accessibility in Digital Humanities", October 22, 2014. <http://dnhblog.maynoothuniversity.ie/mdabek/2014/10/access-accessibility-in-digital-humanities/>

Molly Schwartz, Library of Congress National Digital Stewardship Resident (NDSR), Association of Research Libraries, "Building an Accessible Future for the Humanities", <http://nodetoself-blog.tumblr.com/post/68100555213/building-an-accessible-future-for-the-humanities>.

Melissa Green, "Building an Accessible Future for the Humanities," ThatCamp Alabama 2015. <http://melissafortson.com/professional/thatacamp-alabama-2015/>

Roopika Risam, Salem University, "Revise and Resubmit: An Unsolicited Peer Review", April 20, 2015. <http://roopikarisam.com/uncategorized/revise-and-resubmit-an-unsolicited-peer-review/>

Sarah Kennedy, "Accessible Futures for libraries", The Lib Pub, November 2, 2015. <https://librarypublishing.wordpress.com/2015/11/02/accessible-futures-for-libraries/comment-page-1/>

Rick Godden and Jonathan Hsy, "Universal Design and Its Discontents", *Disrupting the Digital Humanities*, 2016 MLA Position Papers, January 6, 2016. <http://www.disruptingdh.com/universal-design-and-its-discontents/>

Appendix I: Workshop Activities

Workshop 1 Boston:

Initial Goals	Actual Accomplishments
Establishment of Accessible Future Website	Completed September 2013.
Curriculum revision and finalization for Northeastern Workshop	Review of submitted curriculum and finalization of course readings by instructors. Completed October 15, 2013
Call for Participation for Event	The initial call for participation was announced on September 18, 2013 to major listservs, public boards, and professional organizations as well as social media outlets. It was also featured in the <i>Chronicle of Higher Education</i> in the Profhacker column. Applications consisted of a series of questions including what their experience was in digital humanities, issues of accessibility theory, technologies, or approaches, and the potential effect of the workshop on their research, teaching practices, or professional development.
Notification of selected attendees	Selected attendees were notified on October 16, 2013. Thirty submissions of thirty-four were selected to attend the workshop. We also selected four local faculty and students to attend bringing our workshop total to 34.
Completion of pre-workshop materials	Pre-workshop materials included a reading list for workshop sessions, a set of digital humanities projects for participants to review, and establishment of an #AFBBoston twitter tag were completed October 16, 2013. We harvested all twitter data into a spreadsheet that will be included in our final report.
Workshop	A full agenda is attached below.
Post-workshop curricular revision	Instructors met both pre and post-workshop to discuss the pedagogical goals of the workshop. Post-workshop discussion included the revision of three existing sessions (Session 1: Introduction to Disability; Session 3: Universal Design; and Session 5: HTML Accessibility). Additionally, we added a specific session on information density and non-visual, non-auditory disability.
Post-workshop survey	The post workshop survey was completed December 15, 2013. That data was used to revise the curriculum and will be provided in the final report.

Note, following workshop 1, James Smith, our Wordpress instructor, resigned his position at the University of Maryland. Jim remained committed to the project but was unable to attend the Austin workshop. As such, his session was led by George Williams. Jim returned for Workshop 3 at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

Workshop 2 Austin:

Initial Goals	Actual Accomplishments
Review of Social Media commentary and Post-Workshop Survey	January 15, 2014.
Curriculum finalization for Austin Workshop	Finalization of course revision by instructors. Completed March 1, 2014. As part of the curriculum revision, we invited a presenter from HumanWare technologies to provide live demonstration of assistive technologies.
Call for Participation for Austin Workshop	The initial call for participation was announced on December 2, 2013 to major listservs, public boards, and professional organizations as well as social media outlets. Applications consisted of a series of questions including what their experience was in digital humanities, issues of accessibility theory, technologies, or approaches, and the potential effect of the workshop on their research, teaching practices, or professional development.
Notification of selected attendees	Selected attendees were notified on February 4, 2014. Twenty-six submissions were selected of the 49 applicants to attend the workshop.
Completion of pre-workshop materials	Pre-workshop materials included a reading list for workshop sessions, a set of digital humanities projects for participants to review, and establishment of an #AFAustin twitter tag were completed February 4, 2014.
Workshop	A full agenda is attached below.
Post-workshop curricular revision	Instructors met pre-workshop to discuss changes that we had made to the curriculum. Agreement was reached to provide more directed hands-on work with the technologies rather than demonstration purposes.
Post-workshop survey	The post workshop survey was completed April 1, 2014. That data is currently being used to revise the curriculum and will be provided in the final report.

Note that following workshop two, Cory Bohon noted that he would be unable to attend workshop three due to required work commitments. His teaching load was transferred to James Smith for workshop three.

Workshop 3 Lincoln:

Initial Goals	Actual Accomplishments
Updating of Accessible Future Website	Completed September 2014 including updating of wordpress and all plugins.
Curriculum revision and finalization for Lincoln Workshop	Review of participant feedback on curriculum and finalization of course readings by instructors. Completed October 1, 2014
Call for Participation for Event	The initial call for participation was announced on August, 2014 to major listservs, public boards, and professional organizations as well as social media outlets. Participants from previous workshops were

	notified and asked to send notification of the workshop to their various networks.
Notification of selected attendees	Selected attendees were notified on October 5, 2014. Twenty-four attendees were selected to attend the workshop. We also selected five local staff and students to attend bringing our workshop total to 29.
Completion of pre-workshop materials	Pre-workshop materials included an updated reading list for workshop sessions, a set of digital humanities projects for participants to review, and establishment of an #AFLincoln twitter tag were completed October 10, 2014. We harvested all twitter data into a spreadsheet that will be included in our final report.
Workshop	A full agenda is attached below.
Post-workshop curricular revision	Instructors met both pre and post-workshop to discuss the pedagogical goals of the workshop. Post-workshop discussion included expansion of Dan Brown's hands-on demonstration sessions as well as the inclusion of three new tools for identifying accessibility issues in digital environments.
Post-workshop survey	The post workshop survey was completed December 15, 2014. That data will be provided in the final report as well as used as a point of revision for our workshop at Emory University in April 2015.

Workshop 4 Atlanta:

Initial Goals	Actual Accomplishments
Updating of Accessible Future Website	Completed April 1, 2015 including updating of wordpress and all plugins.
Curriculum revision and finalization for Lincoln Workshop	Review of participant feedback on curriculum and finalization of course readings by instructors. Completed March 15, 2015.
Call for Participation for Event	The initial call for participation was announced in December 2014 to major listservs, public boards, and professional organizations as well as social media outlets. Participants from previous workshops were notified and asked to send notification of the workshop to their various networks.
Notification of selected attendees	Selected attendees were notified on March 31, 2015. Thirty-two attendees were selected to attend the workshop. We also selected five local staff and students to attend bringing our workshop total to 37.
Completion of pre-workshop materials	Pre-workshop materials included an updated reading list for workshop sessions, a set of digital

	humanities projects for participants to review, and establishment of an #AFLincoln twitter tag were completed April 1, 2015. We harvested all twitter data into a spreadsheet that will be included in our final report.
Workshop	A full agenda is attached below.
Post-workshop curricular revision	Instructors met both pre and post-workshop to discuss the pedagogical goals of the workshop. Post-workshop discussion included discussion of offering a fifth workshop to be hosted on the West Coast.
Post-workshop survey	The post workshop survey is being completed as this report is being written. That data will be provided in the final report as well as used as a point of revision for our fifth workshop should it be approved by NEH.

Workshop 5 Los Angeles:

Initial Goals	Actual Accomplishments
Updating of Accessible Future Website	Completed August 1, 2015 including updating of wordpress and all plugins.
Curriculum revision and finalization for Lincoln Workshop	Review of participant feedback on curriculum and finalization of course readings by instructors. Completed August 1, 2015.
Call for Participation for Event	The initial call for participation was announced in May 2015 to major listservs, public boards, and professional organizations as well as social media outlets. Participants from previous workshops were notified and asked to send notification of the workshop to their various networks.
Notification of selected attendees	Selected attendees were notified on August 1-4, 2015. Twenty-four attendees were selected to attend the workshop.
Completion of pre-workshop materials	Pre-workshop materials included an updated reading list for workshop sessions, a set of digital humanities projects for participants to review, and establishment of an #AFLA twitter tag were completed August 15, 2015. We harvested all twitter data into a spreadsheet that will be included in our final report.
Workshop	A full agenda is attached below.
Post-workshop curricular revision	Instructors met both pre and post-workshop to discuss the pedagogical goals of the workshop. Post-workshop discussion revolves around transitioning curricular materials to an open educational resource (OER).
Post-workshop survey	The post workshop survey has been complete. That data is provided in the appendix to this report.

Appendix II: Workshop Syllabi

Workshop Agendas:

Accessible Future Boston

Day 1:

Time	Activities	Required Readings and Case Studies
8:30-9 am	Registration and Coffee	
9-9:15	Welcome	
9:15-10:45	Session 1: Led by Dr. Tina Herzberg	Philip M. Ferguson, Emily Nusbaum, "Disability Studies: What Is It?", <i>Research & Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities</i> (2012) Vol. 37, No. 2, 70-80. Jonathan Lazar, Paul Jaeger, "Reducing Barriers to Online Access for People with Disabilities," <i>Issues in Science and Technology</i> (Winter 2011), 69-82.
10:45-11	Break	
11-12:30	Session 2: Led by Dr. Tina Herzberg	Kessler Foundation and National Organization on Disability, "The ADA 20 Years Later: An Executive Summary," July 2010. Available from: http://www.2010disabilitysurveys.org/pdfs/surveysummary.pdf
12:30-1:30	Lunch	
1:30-3	Session 3: Led by Dr. George Williams	George H. Williams, "Disability, Universal Design, and the Digital Humanities," <i>Debates in Digital Humanities</i> . University of Minnesota Press. Available from: http://dhdebates.gc.cuny.edu/debates/text/44 "How People with Disabilities Use the Web," <i>Web Accessibility Initiative</i> http://www.w3.org/WAI/intro/people-use-web/ "Considering the User Perspective: A Summary of Design Issues," <i>WebAIM</i> http://webaim.org/articles/userperspective/
3-3:15	Break	

3:15-5 pm	Session 4: Led by Dr. George Williams	<p>Evaluation and discussion of a number of online resources, including the following:</p> <p><i>The Shakespeare Quartos Archive</i> http://www.quartos.org</p> <p><i>The William Blake Archive</i> http://www.blakearchive.org</p> <p><i>The Bracero History Archive</i> http://braceroarchive.org</p> <p><i>Cornell University Library: Making of America</i> http://ebooks.library.cornell.edu/m/moa/</p> <p>Visualizing Emancipation http://dsl.richmond.edu/emancipation/</p> <p><i>Deaf Studies Digital Journal</i> http://dsdj.gallaudet.edu</p> <p><i>Nineteenth-Century Disability: A Digital Reader</i> http://www.nineteenthcenturydisability.org</p> <p><i>BrailleSC.org</i> http://BrailleSC.org</p>
-----------	--	---

Day 2:

Time	Activities	Required Readings and Case Studies
8:30-9 am	Registration and Coffee	
9-11:30	Session 5: Jeremy Boggs (HTML/CSS)	<p>Peterson, "Accessibility in HTML5" (http://www.clarissapeterson.com/2012/11/html5-accessibility/)</p> <p><i>HTML5 Accessibility</i> (http://html5accessibility.com/)</p> <p>Webplatform.org (http://www.webplatform.org/)</p>
11:30-11:45	Break	
11:45-12:45	Session 6: Jim Smith (Wordpress)	<p>Wordpress Accessibility Documentation (http://codex.wordpress.org/Accessibility)</p>

		Wordpress Accessibility Plugin (http://make.wordpress.org/accessibility/wp-accessibility-plugin/)
12:45-2	Lunch	
2-2:45	Session 7: Cory Bohon (Omeka)	W3C Accessibility Standards (http://www.w3.org/standards/webdesign/accessibility) Omeka Theme Writing Best Practices (http://omeka.org/codex/Theme_Writing_Best_Practices)
2:45-3:15	Break	
3:15-4:30 pm	Session 8: Dr. Jennifer Guiliano	Future Directions in Digital Humanities and Accessibility
4:30-5 pm	Wrap Up	

Accessible Future Austin Workshop:

Session 1

- Philip M. Ferguson, Emily Nusbaum, “[Disability Studies: What Is It?](#)”, *Research & Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities* (2012) Vol. 37, No. 2, 70-80.
- Jonathan Lazar, Paul Jaeger, “[Reducing Barriers to Online Access for People with Disabilities,](#)” *Issues in Science and Technology*(Winter 2011), 69-82.

Session 2

- Kessler Foundation and National Organization on Disability, “The ADA 20 Years Later: An Executive Summary,” July 2010. [Available here](#)

Session 3

- George H. Williams, “Disability, Universal Design, and the Digital Humanities,” *Debates in Digital Humanities*. University of Minnesota Press. [Available here](#)
- “How People with Disabilities Use the Web,” *Web Accessibility Initiative*. [Available here](#)
- “Considering the User Perspective: A Summary of Design Issues,” *Web Accessibility Initiative WebAIM*

Session 4

- [The Shakespeare Quartos Archive](#)
- [The William Blake Archive](#)
- [The Bracero History Archive](#)
- [Cornell University Library: Making of America](#)
- [Visualizing Emancipation](#)
- [Deaf Studies Digital Journal](#)
- [Nineteenth-Century Disability: A Digital Reader](#)
- [BrailleSC.org](#)

Session 5

- Peterson, “[Accessibility in HTML5](#)”

- [HTML5 Accessibility](#)
- [Webplatform.org](#)

Session 6

- [WordPress Codex Accessibility](#)
- [WordPress Accessibility Plugin](#)

Session 7

- [W3C Accessibility Standards](#)
- [Omeka Theme Writing Best Practices](#)

Session 8

- Cognitive Disabilities: Information Density and Accessibility
- Future Directions in Accessibility and Digital Humanities

AF Lincoln Agenda

Location: Library Instruction Room, First Floor Rm S110, Love Library

DAY 1

8:30 – 9:00 am

- Registration and Coffee

9:00 – 9:15 am

- Welcome

Session 1: Led by Dr. Tina Herzberg

9:15 – 9:45 am: Lecture

- Philip M. Ferguson, Emily Nusbaum, “[Disability Studies: What Is It?](#)”, *Research & Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities* (2012) Vol. 37, No. 2, 70-80.
- Jonathan Lazar, Paul Jaeger, “[Reducing Barriers to Online Access for People with Disabilities](#),” *Issues in Science and Technology*(Winter 2011), 69-82.

9:45 – 10:15 am

- Group Activity: Defining Accessibility for oneself. What is your personal definition?

Session 2: Led by Dan Brown, Humanware

10:15 – Noon: Demonstration: Accessible Hardware for Disabled Users

- Kessler Foundation and National Organization on Disability, “The ADA 20 Years Later: An Executive Summary,” July 2010. [Available here](#)

Noon- 12:45 pm: Lunch

Session 3: Led by Dr. George Williams

12:45 – 1:45 pm: Lecture and Discussion

- George H. Williams, “Disability, Universal Design, and the Digital Humanities,” *Debates in Digital Humanities*. University of Minnesota Press. [Available here](#)

1:45-2 pm: Break

Session 4: Led by Dr. Jennifer Guiliano

2:00 – 2:30 pm: Cognitive Disabilities and the Web

- “Evaluating Cognitive Web Accessibility,” *Web Accessibility Initiative* [WebAIM](#)
http://webaim.org/articles/cognitive/cognitive_too_little/

The presentation on cognitive disabilities and the web is available in PDF form. [Cognitive Lecture Accessible Future](#)

2:30 – 3:00 pm: Deafness, deafness, and accessibility

- “Deafness and the User Experience,” by Lisa Herrod
<http://alistapart.com/article/deafnessandtheuserexperience>

The presentation on Deafness, deafness, and accessibility is available in PDF form. [Deafness and Accessibility](#)

Session 5: Led by Dr. George Williams and Jeremy Boggs

3:00 – 4:30 pm: Evaluating Web Accessibility

- “How People with Disabilities Use the Web,” *Web Accessibility Initiative*. [Available here](#)
- “Considering the User Perspective: A Summary of Design Issues,” *Web Accessibility Initiative WebAIM*
- http://www.456bereastreet.com/archive/200709/10_colour_contrast_checking_tools_to_improve_the_accessibility_of_your_design/
- Browser add ons to simulate color blindness types, e.g. <https://addons.mozilla.org/en-US/firefox/addon/colorblind-design/>
- Google Chrome Accessibility Tools: <https://chrome.google.com/webstore/detail/accessibility-developer-t/fpkknkljclfencbdbgkenhalefipecmb?hl=en>

Either use the [WAVE web page interface](#), or download and install the [WAVE Toolbar for Firefox](#).

- The WAVE Firefox toolbar provides a mechanism for running WAVE accessibility reports directly within Firefox.

(See also “[Web Accessibility Evaluation Tools: Overview](#).”)

Please also explore Pa11y, the automated accessibility testing system (<http://pa11y.org/>) and

HTML_Codesniffer: http://squizlabs.github.io/HTML_CodeSniffer/

Small Group activity: Evaluation and discussion of a number of online resources, including the following:

- [The Shakespeare Quartos Archive](#)
- [The William Blake Archive](#)
- [The Bracero History Archive](#)
- [Cornell University Library: Making of America](#)
- [Visualizing Emancipation](#)
- [Deaf Studies Digital Journal](#)
- [Nineteenth-Century Disability: A Digital Reader](#)
- [BrailleSC.org](#)

Session 6: Led by Jeremy Boggs

4:30-5 pm: Integrating accessibility testing into the workflow of projects and workplaces

Day 2

Please note the doors to the library do not open until 9 am.

9:15-9:30 am Coffee

Session 7: Led by Jeremy Boggs

9:30-10:30 am: HTML and CSS Concepts

- Peterson, “[Accessibility in HTML5](#)”
- [HTML5 Accessibility](#)
- [Webplatform.org](#)

View the session information: <http://clioweb.github.io/accessiblenfuture/>

Session 8: Led by Jeremy Boggs and James Smith

10:30-11:30 am: Hands On with HTML and CSS to Address Accessibility Issues

11:30-11:45 am: Break

12:50-1:30: Continuing with HTML and CSS this time talking about responsive design

Session 9: Led by James Smith

1:30-2:30 pm: WordPress

- [WordPress Codex Accessibility](#)
- [WordPress Accessibility Plugin](#)
- [W3C Accessibility Standards](#)

Session 10: Led by George Williams and Tina Herzberg

2:30-3:15 pm: Encouraging/soliciting feedback from users with accessibility concerns

3:15-3:30 pm break

Session 11: Led by Jennifer Guiliano

3:30- 4 pm: Advocating for Accessibility on your campus by creating an Accessibility Statement

AF Emory Agenda

Please note that we will be using two different locations for this workshop.

DAY 1

Location: Candler School of Theology, Room 360.

The closest parking deck to this location is Peavine.

8:30 – 9:00 am

- Registration and Coffee/Continental Breakfast

9:00 – 9:15 am

- Welcome

Session 1: Led by Dr. Tina Herzberg

9:15 – 9:45 am: Lecture

- Philip M. Ferguson, Emily Nusbaum, “[Disability Studies: What Is It?](#)”, *Research & Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities* (2012) Vol. 37, No. 2, 70-80.
- Jonathan Lazar, Paul Jaeger, “[Reducing Barriers to Online Access for People with Disabilities.](#),” *Issues in Science and Technology*(Winter 2011), 69-82.

9:45 – 10:15 am

- Group Activity: Defining Accessibility for oneself. What is your personal definition?

Session 2: Demonstrations of Accessibility Hardware for Disabled Users

10:15 – 11 am: Demonstration: Accessible Hardware for Disabled Users

- Kessler Foundation and National Organization on Disability, “[The ADA 20 Years Later: An Executive Summary](#),” July 2010.

Session 3: Led by Dr. George Williams

11- noon: Lecture and Discussion

- George H. Williams, “[Disability, Universal Design, and the Digital Humanities](#),” *Debates in Digital Humanities*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Sara Hendren, “[All Technology is Assistive](#).”

Noon- 12:45 pm: Lunch

Session 4: Led by Dr. Jennifer Guiliano

12:45 – 1:30 pm: Cognitive Disabilities and the Web

- “Evaluating Cognitive Web Accessibility,” *Web Accessibility Initiative* [WebAIM](#)
http://webaim.org/articles/cognitive/cognitive_too_little/

The presentation on cognitive disabilities and the web is available in PDF form. [Cognitive Lecture Accessible Future](#)

1:30-1:45 pm Break

1:45-2:30 pm: Deafness, deafness, and accessibility

- “Deafness and the User Experience,” by Lisa Herrod
<http://alistapart.com/article/deafnessandtheuserexperience>

The presentation on Deafness, deafness, and accessibility is available in PDF form. [Deafness and Accessibility](#)

2:30 – 4:00 pm: **Session 5: Led by Dr. George Williams and Jeremy Boggs**

Evaluating Web Accessibility

- “[How People with Disabilities Use the Web](#),” *Web Accessibility Initiative*.
- “Considering the User Perspective: A Summary of Design Issues,” *Web Accessibility Initiative* [WebAIM](#)
- http://www.456bereastreet.com/archive/200709/10_colour_contrast_checking_tools_to_improve_the_accessibility_of_your_design/
- Browser add ons to simulate color blindness types, e.g. <https://addons.mozilla.org/en-US/firefox/addon/colorblind-design/>

- Google Chrome Accessibility Tools: <https://chrome.google.com/webstore/detail/accessibility-developer-t/fpkknkljclfencbdbgkenhalefipecmb?hl=en>

Either use the [WAVE web page interface](#), or download and install the [WAVE Toolbar for Firefox](#).

- The WAVE Firefox toolbar provides a mechanism for running WAVE accessibility reports directly within Firefox.

(See also “[Web Accessibility Evaluation Tools: Overview](#).”)

Please also explore Pa1ly, the automated accessibility testing system (<http://pa1ly.org/>) and

HTML_Codesniffer: http://squizlabs.github.io/HTML_CodeSniffer/

Small Group activity: Evaluation and discussion of a number of online resources, including the following:

- [The Shakespeare Quartos Archive](#)
- [The William Blake Archive](#)
- [The Bracero History Archive](#)
- [Cornell University Library: Making of America](#)
- [Visualizing Emancipation](#)
- [Deaf Studies Digital Journal](#)
- [Nineteenth-Century Disability: A Digital Reader](#)
- [BrailleSC.org](#)

Session 6: Led by Jeremy Boggs

4-4:30 pm: Integrating accessibility testing into the workflow of projects and workplaces

Day 2

Workshop Location: Jones Room, Woodruff Library

Please note the doors to the library do not open until 9 am for visitors. The closest parking deck to this location is Fishburne.

9:15-9:30 am Coffee

Session 7: Led by Jeremy Boggs

9:30-10:30 am: HTML and CSS Concepts

- Peterson, “[Accessibility in HTML5](#)”
- [HTML5 Accessibility](#)
- [Webplatform.org](#)

View the session information: <http://clioweb.github.io/accessiblefuture/>

Session 8: Led by Jeremy Boggs and James Smith

10:30-Noon am: Hands On with HTML and CSS to Address Accessibility Issues and Responsive Design

Noon- 12:45 pm: Lunch

Session 9: Led by James Smith

12:45-1:30 pm: WordPress

- [WordPress Codex Accessibility](#)
- [WordPress Accessibility Plugin](#)
- [W3C Accessibility Standards](#)

1:30-1:45 pm: Break

Session 10: Led by Cory Bohon

1:45-2:45 pm: Working with Omeka

- [W3C Accessibility Standards](#)
- [Omeka Theme Writing Best Practices](#)

Session 10: Led by George Williams and Tina Herzberg

2:45-3:30 pm: Encouraging/soliciting feedback from users with accessibility concerns

Session 11: Led by Jennifer Guiliano

3:30- 4 pm: Advocating for Accessibility on your campus by creating an Accessibility Statement

AF Los Angeles Agenda (revised August 3)

Both days of this workshop will take place in the same location: **Rolfe Hall, Center for Digital Humanities Learning Lab, Room 2118.**

The closest parking structure to this location is Parking Structure 5, 302 Charles E. Young Drive, North 90095. This is a pay by space garage.

DAY 1

8:30 – 9:00 am

- Registration and Coffee/Continental Breakfast

9:00 – 9:15 am

- Welcome

Session 1: Led by Dr. Tina Herzberg

9:15 – 9:45 am: Lecture

- Philip M. Ferguson, Emily Nusbaum, “[Disability Studies: What Is It?](#)”, *Research & Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities* (2012) Vol. 37, No. 2, 70-80.
- Jonathan Lazar, Paul Jaeger, “[Reducing Barriers to Online Access for People with Disabilities.](#),” *Issues in Science and Technology*(Winter 2011), 69-82.

9:45 – 10:15 am

- Group Activity: Defining Accessibility for oneself. What is your personal definition?

Session 2: Demonstrations of Accessibility Hardware for Disabled Users led by Clay Jeffcoat

10:15 – 11 am: Demonstration: Accessible Hardware for Disabled Users

- Kessler Foundation and National Organization on Disability, “[The ADA 20 Years Later: An Executive Summary](#),” July 2010.

Session 3: Led by Dr. George Williams

11- noon: Lecture and Discussion

- George H. Williams, “[Disability, Universal Design, and the Digital Humanities](#),” *Debates in Digital Humanities*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Sara Hendren, “[All Technology is Assistive](#).”

Noon- 12:45 pm: Lunch

Session 4:

12:45 – 1:30 pm: Cognitive Disabilities and the Web

- Suggested reading: “Evaluating Cognitive Web Accessibility,” *Web Accessibility Initiative WebAIM* http://webaim.org/articles/cognitive/cognitive_too_little/

- The presentation slide deck on cognitive disabilities and the web is available in PDF form. [Cognitive Lecture Accessible Future](#)

1:30-1:45 pm Break

1:45-2:30 pm: Deafness, deafness, and accessibility

- “Deafness and the User Experience,” by Lisa Herrod <http://alistapart.com/article/deafnessandtheuserexperience>
- The presentation slide deck on Deafness, deafness, and accessibility is available in PDF form. [Deafness and Accessibility](#)

2:30 – 4:00 pm: **Session 5: Led by Dr. George Williams and Jeremy Boggs**

Evaluating Web Accessibility

- “[How People with Disabilities Use the Web](#),” *Web Accessibility Initiative*.
- “Considering the User Perspective: A Summary of Design Issues,” *Web Accessibility Initiative WebAIM*
- http://www.456bereastreet.com/archive/200709/10_colour_contrast_checking_tools_to_improve_the_accessibility_of_your_design/
- Browser add ons to simulate color blindness types, e.g. <https://addons.mozilla.org/en-US/firefox/addon/colorblind-design/>
- Google Chrome Accessibility Tools: <https://chrome.google.com/webstore/detail/accessibility-developer-t/fpkknkljclfencbdbgkenhalefipecmb?hl=en>

Either use the [WAVE web page interface](#), or download and install the [WAVE Toolbar for Firefox](#).

- The WAVE Firefox toolbar provides a mechanism for running WAVE accessibility reports directly within Firefox.

(See also “[Web Accessibility Evaluation Tools: Overview](#).”)

Please also explore Pa11y, the automated accessibility testing system (<http://pa11y.org/>) and HTML_Codesniffer: http://squizlabs.github.io/HTML_CodeSniffer/

Small Group activity: Evaluation and discussion of a number of online resources, including the following:

- [The Shakespeare Quartos Archive](#)
- [The William Blake Archive](#)
- [The Bracero History Archive](#)
- [Cornell University Library: Making of America](#)
- [Visualizing Emancipation](#)
- [Deaf Studies Digital Journal](#)
- [Nineteenth-Century Disability: A Digital Reader](#)
- [BrailleSC.org](#)

Session 6: Led by Jeremy Boggs

4-4:30 pm: Integrating accessibility testing into the workflow of projects and workplaces

View the session information: <http://clioweb.github.io/accessiblefuture/>

Day 2

Workshop Location: Rolfe Hall, Center for Digital Humanities Learning Lab, Room 2118.

9:15-9:30 am Coffee

Session 7: Led by Jeremy Boggs

9:30-10:30 am: HTML and CSS Concepts

- Peterson, “[Accessibility in HTML5](#)”
- [HTML5 Accessibility](#)
- [Webplatform.org](#)
- View the session information: <http://clioweb.github.io/accessiblefuture/>

Session 8: Led by Jeremy Boggs and James Smith

10:30-Noon am: Hands On with HTML and CSS to Address Accessibility Issues and Responsive Design

Noon- 12:45 pm: Lunch

Session 9: Led by James Smith

12:45-1:30 pm: WordPress

- [WordPress Codex Accessibility](#)
- [WordPress Accessibility Plugin](#)
- [W3C Accessibility Standards](#)

1:30-1:45 pm: Break

Session 10: Led by Jeremy Boggs

1:45-2:45 pm: Working with Omeka

- [W3C Accessibility Standards](#)
- [Omeka Themes Documentation](#)

Session 10: Led by George Williams and Tina Herzberg

2:45-3:30 pm: Encouraging/soliciting feedback from users with accessibility concerns

Session 11:

3:30- 4 pm: Advocating for Accessibility on your campus by creating an Accessibility Statement

Appendix III: Attendees

Last Name	First Name	Current Professional/Institutional Affiliation:	Current Title:
Abbott	Franky	Digital Public Library of America	ACLS Public Fellow/Project Manager
Alwani	Raoul	Lachmann Technologies (http://www.lachmann-tech.com)	Managing Director
Anderson	Steve	UC Riverside	PhD Candidate, Department of History
Angela	Salas	Indiana University Southeast	Director of Honors Program/Professor of English
Appleford	Simon	Creighton University	Assistant Professor
Ayotte	Dana	Inclusive Design Research Centre	Inclusive/Interaction Designer
Barnason	Jennifer	Center for Digital Research in the Humanities, University of Nebraska Lincoln	
Becker	Suzanne	Texas School for the Blind/University of Texas iSchool	Graduate student at UT/ Administrative Assistant at TSBVI
Bicknell	Mike	Texas School for the Blind & Visually Impaired	Media, Web, Distance Learning Developer and Designer
Blankenship-Billings	Chrisanne	Research and Report, LLC	President
Boice	Kristin	California State University	Information Architect
Bourrier	Karen	Boston University	Dr.
Brock	Julia	Kennesaw State University	Director of Interpretation
Burke	Patrick		
Carpio	Genevieve	UCLA	Assistant Professor
Castiglione	Deb	University of Kentucky	Universal Design & Instructional Technology Specialist
Chase	Elizabeth	Stonehill College	Head of Collections, Assessment and User Engagement
Chen	Jiatyan	Michigan State University	Creative Service Manager
Cohen	Patricia	Tufts University School of Dental Medicine	Assistant Clinical Professor
Cong-Huyen	Anne	Whittier College	Digital Scholar
Constable	Elizabeth	University of California, Davis	Associate Professor

Cordell	Sigrid	University of Michigan Library	Librarian for English Language and Literature
Cox	Thomas	Tufts University	Manager of Library IT Services
Crawford	Jordan	Emory University	
Crisp	Jenny	Dalton State College	QEP Director and Assistant Professor of English
Currey	Meghan	Texas School for the Blind and Visually Impaired	Digital Archivist and Digital Media Librarian
Dalziel	Karen	University of Nebraska	
Danforth	Courtney	College of Southern Nevada and Kairos (journal)	Professor
Darbandi	Shiva	University of Maine at Augusta	Academic Librarian: Off-Campus Library Services Coordinator
Davis	Andrea	USC Upstate	Assistant Professor
Davis	Andrea	Western New England University	Associate Professor of Communication
Demarest	Sally	Cuesta College	Instructor, English Department
diancheng	hu	Ishcool of UT Austin	graduate student
Donlon	Anne	Emory University	
Downie	J. Stephen	Graduate School of Libaryan and Information Science, Hathitrust Research Center, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	Professor, Associate Dean for Research, Co-Director of HTRC
Dussault	Jessica	University of Nebraska	
Edwards	Rebekah	California College of the Arts	Adjunct profesor
Egan	Bridget	Oregon State University	Program Manager
Floyd	Susan	The University of Texas at Austin	MSIS Graduate Student
Fox	Ann	Davidson College	Professor of English
Gao	Jin	School of Information at UT Austin	PhD student
Geer	Caroline	Comprehensa	Information Broker
Geraci	Noah	UCLA Dept of Information Studies/Digital Library Program	MLIS student/Digital Library Program assistant
Goergen	Corey	Emory University	
Goldberg	Larry	WGBH National Center for Accessible Media (NCAM)	Director
Green	Harriett	University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	English and Digital Humanities Librarian
Griffin	June	University of Nebraska-Lincoln	Associate Professor of Practice

Guilbeau	Janis	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	Assistant Professor, Nursing
Hecker	Jennifer	University of Texas Libraries	Digital Access Archivist/Developer
Henderson	Ethan	UC Santa Cruz	Director of Development
Hendren	Sara	Rhode Island School of Design	Lecturer
Hoover	Ryan	St. Edward's University	Asst Professor, English Writing & Rhetoric
Hordzwick	Kristina	UCLA	Student
Horton	Patricia	Dalton State College	LMS Admin/Webmaster
Horton	Mary	Medicine/ILA	Director/Graduate Candidate
Horvath	Jaclyn	Decker School of Nursing at Binghamton University	Assistant to the director
Huffer	Jeremy	Methodist Theological School in Ohio	Director of Instructional Design
Hutson	Melissa	University of Texas at Austin	Student
Huttenlock	Terry	Wheaton College	Associate Professor of Library Science, Educational Technology Librarian
Kaplan	Deborah	Tufts University	Digital Resources Archivist
Kaur	Vinamarata	University of Cincinnati (Ohio)	Graduate Student/TA
Keister	Kirsten	MITH, University of Maryland	Graphic Designer
Kennedy	Sarah	West Virginia University Library	Agriculture, Natural Resources, Design, and Extension Librarian
Kleinfeld	Elizabeth	Metropolitan State University of Denver	Writing Center Director, Associate Professor of English
Koh	Adeline	Richard Stockton College	Director, DH@Stockton, Asst Prof of Literature
Larson	Alison	Baylor University Crouch Fine Arts Library	Art Reference/Weekend Operations
Levy	Ely	UCLA	Lead Website Developer
Lewis	A. David	Bentley University	Adjunct Faculty
Locke	Brandon	Michigan State University	Director, LEADR
Lownes	Steven	University of Georgia	Assistant Director of Latin American and Caribbean Studies Institute
Luce	Johnny	University of Texas, Austin Community College, and DeVry University	Graduate Student, Adjunct Professor
Maher	Monica	Omaha Public Library	Library Specialist

Matts	Lindsay	University of Minnesota	Instructional Designer - University Libraries
Mazuk	Melody	reSource Leadership International	Director of Library Development
McAulay	Lisa	UCLA	Interim Head, Digital Library Program
Mena	Gregory	California State University, Northridge	Instructional Designer
Meyers	Melanie	The Center for Jewish History	Senior Reference Services Librarian for Special Collections
Miranda Trigueos	Ernesto	INAH	Head of Innovation
Mitchell	Jess	Inclusive Design Research Centre, OCAD University	Senior Manager, R&D + Design
Moreno	Joseba	University of Nebraska, Lincoln	PhD student/Lab manager
Morgan	Paige	University of Washington	Ph.D. student/Instructor
Morgen	E. David	Emory University	Writing Program Coordinator
Morgen	David	Emory University Writing Program	Project Manager, Domain of One's Own
Moss	Janalyn	University of Iowa	American History Librarian
Nelson	Chad	Jenkins Law Library	Developer
Nettleton	Jennifer	SUNY Empire State College	Coordinator of Curriculum and Instruction
Nguyen	Kimberly	Roy Rosenzweig Center for History and New Media	Web Designer
Norris	Laura	University of Texas	Student
OBrien	Michael	Iowa State University, also working professional Asurion	Graduate Student at ISU, Software Engineer III at Asurion
Paige	Christine	Empire State College	Lead Instructional Designer
Palacios	Albert	Harry Ransom Center/University of Texas at Austin	Film Curatorial Assistant/PhD Student
Palmer	Sara	Emory University	
Poli	Eric	Freelance	Designer
Reed	Scott	Internet Archive until August, then UCLA MLIS student	Web Archivist
Reynolds	Joel Michael	Emory University	
Risam	Roopika	Salem State University	Assistant Professor of English
Rodick	Alena	Empire State College - SUNY	Instructional Designer
Rogers	Katina	Modern Language Association	Managing Editor, MLA Commons

Rose	McKenna	Emory University	Graduate Fellow
Rosen	Stephanie	Five College Women's Studies Research Center; University of Texas Austin	Research Associate; PhD Candidate in English
Roy	Sarah	Lincoln Memorial University	Head of Access Services
Ruelas	Cousett	St. Edward's University	Instructional Designer
Rustici	Craig	Hofstra University	Professor and Department Chair
Sanders	Laura	Portland Community College	Instructor
Sanera	Devin	Cornell University	Instructional Technology Coordinator
Sarnacki	Brian	University of Nebraska-Lincoln	Ph.D. Candidate
Scheg	Abigail	Elizabeth City State University	Assistant Professor
Schwartz	Molly	Libraries of Congress, Association of Research Libraries	National Digital Stewardship Resident
Senier	Siobhan	University of New Hampshire	Assoc. Prof, English
Sharpe	Celeste	George Mason University, RRCHNM	PhD Candidate
Shepard	David	UCLA	Lead Academic Developer
Smith	Holly	Spelman College	College Archivist
Snider	Lisa	Harry Ransom Center-UT Austin	Electronic Records Archivist
Stoller	Tracy	Indiana Tech	Assistant Librarian
Strauber	Chris	Tufts University	Humanities Research Librarian, Instructional Design Coordinator
Templeton	Erin	Converse College	Associate Professor of English
Thomason	Meghan	University of Wisconsin-Stout	Digital Materials Assistant
Thompson	Chris	UCLA	IT Manager
Townsel	Melinda	Project Enable at Austin Community College	Accessibility Facilitator for ACC Library Services
Troka	Donna	Emory University	
Tucker	Lucian	UCLA	
Ugwu	Emilia	Northeastern University	Doctoral student
Ursery	Danney	St. Edward's University	Professor of Philosophy
Vargas	Alyssa	UCLA	
Walker	Wendy	University of Montana-Missoula	Digital Initiatives Librarian
Walker	Judy	University of North Carolina Charlotte	Education/Psychology Librarian
Walter	Kay	Center for Digital Research in the Humanities, University of Nebraska Lincoln	Director

Weiss	Alicia	Montgomery County Community College	Director of Services for Students with Disabilities
Whitesell	Melissa	Dalton State College	Reference/Instructional Librarian
Zafrin	Vika	Boston University	Institutional Repository Librarian
Zdenek	Sean	Texas Tech University	Associate Professor